THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 111, NO. 1 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JULY 3, 1944 NUMBER 1544

After Cherbourg What?

With the fall of Cherbourg the strategists on both sides face critical decisions. The Allies must decide whether to exploit their victory by extending the present beachhead and aiming at the capture of additional ports such as Le Havre and Brest, or to make a landing elsewhere at this juncture. The Germans must decide whether to throw in strategic reserves against the forces in Normandy or to continue holding these reserves against the possibility of a landing elsewhere.

While Cherbourg is an important port, it is not alone sufficient to handle the traffic for an army of the size required to defeat the main German forces. If the Germans throw sufficient reserves against the Normandy beachhead before it is much further extended, they may have a chance of containing it, but if they do this they will weaken their capacity to deal with another invasion in the south of France, in the Low Countries or at some other fairly distant point. If the Allies make such a landing before the German strategic reserves are committed, the new invasion would be far more risky, although it might serve as a diversion for the benefit of the foothold already established.

This battle of wits may have been decided by the time this issue of The New Republic reaches its readers, but however it is decided, the military resources in the hands of the Allies are sufficient so that the Germans can hardly avoid leaving themselves exposed to much stronger opposition than they have met so far.

The Basis of Strategy

One factor of commanding importance must be remembered in understanding what is happening on the western front in Europe. The sound strategic aim for both belligerents is not primarily to gain or hold territory, but to put the opposing army out of action. This may be one reason why our High Command decided to strike in Normandy rather than nearer to the heart of the enemy. Decisive battles fought in France will present to the Germans more difficult problems of transportation and communication than contacts nearer home, whereas the difference between Allied transportation difficulties on the route from England to Normandy and those on the route from England to Calais or the Low Countries is negligible. We have of course the added advantage of being able to harass enemy communications by superior air power.

Considerations of this sort undoubtedly entered into the decision to strike first in Africa, then in Sicily and Italy. They would be influential in supporting any plan to land in the south of France or on her western coast. Of course this does not mean that after the bulk of the German armies were engaged in France, another landing closer to the Reich and hence in their rear might not be thought advisable.

Robots and Caen

Official propaganda of both belligerents about the robot bombs has avoided the main issue. The Germans have dwelt on the destruction they were supposed to be causing in England, while the British have minimized their damage and the effect on civilian

CONTENTS

The Week 3
Editorials
The Monetary Isolationists 5
The White-Collar Worker 7
General Articles
British Isles and Bretton Woods . . . . . Richard Lee Strout 9
The People's Stake in Radio . Bernard B. Smith 11
How Should We Attack Japan? . . . . . Joseph Rosenfarb 13
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 15
Three New Ones . . . . Manny Farber 16
The Bandwagon 16
Correspondence 17
Books in Review
All the Way . . . . . George Mayberry 18
Labor Kibitzer . . . Harold J. Ruttenberg 19
Villard on the Press . . . . Bruce Bliven 20
To the North . . . Robert Leigh Weaver 20
Anti-Anti-Semitism . . . . Alfred Werner 21
A Reader's List 22

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morale. As a matter of fact, however, their chief usefulness to the German High Command consists in the diversion of Allied air power which is being employed to combat them. The stories about Allied fighters chasing and destroying them in flight are romantic, but if any considerable number of planes were used for this purpose, the air power which could be directed against the German army would be diminished. In any case, it requires large forces of bombers to destroy the launching platforms. Fortunately the air superiority of the Allies is so great that this diversion is not likely to have an important effect on the progress of the campaign in France.

Incidentally, the heavy resistance which the Germans have been throwing against the British at the Caen or eastern end of the beachhead may be dictated partly by the desire to protect these launching platforms from encirclement by land. Undoubtedly, however, an equally strong reason is the desire of the Germans to be able to contain the Normandy beachhead if possible before it embraces another port like Le Havre. The British in their stiff fighting on this flank have been performing a service which, while less spectacular than the capture of Cherbourg by the Americans, has been equally arduous and fully as necessary for the eventual success of the campaign.

An Indecisive Naval Victory

The naval battle in the neighborhood of Saipan represents a defeat for the Japanese but not an American victory of the magnitude which early reports led us to hope for. The chief objective of the Japanese was to check our conquest of the island, which makes an excellent bombing base for use against the Japanese homeland. While the immediate objective of the American expedition was the conquest of this base, its principal goal has for long been to bring the Japanese grand fleet to bay and destroy it. In spite of the heavy damage inflicted on the enemy's navy, it escaped a decisive engagement. Thus it lives to fight another day nearer home and perhaps under more favorable conditions.

Of course if our naval strategists succeed in forcing the Japanese fleet out of action without a knockdown and dragout fight we may win the war with fewer losses to our own fleet and personnel. This was what happened to the German navy in the First World War. Nevertheless, our navy suffered a major disappointment in not inflicting more damage than it did in this engagement.

Finland's Plight

A good many sentimental tears are being shed in the United States concerning the Russian victories in Finland and the dismissal of Minister Procope by our government. It is true that the Finnish people are for the most part democratic and desire only independence, and that they are suffering severely. But this is true of the peoples of most Axis victims, no matter on which side of the war they stand. It has been obvious for a long time that those in control of Finnish governmental policy are pro-German and are strongly tinged with fascism. The Finns were offered an honorable opportunity to change sides in the war not many weeks ago. They had a choice between expelling the German troops with Russian aid or facing a new Russian drive which might overrun their country. They made the wrong choice and must suffer the consequences.

The war against the Axis has been appreciably deterred by the presence of German divisions in Finland and by the diversion which the Finns have supplied on the northern Russian front. The Finns themselves will benefit in the long run by the overthrow of the government which insisted on hitching their wagon to the falling German star.

The Needless Convention

The Republican National Convention appears to be a gigantic waste of transportation, hotel space and manpower in view of the necessities of war. Apparently it is assembled to arrive at a foregone conclusion by nominating Governor Dewey and drafting a platform acceptable to him. We should be the last to say that a truly deliberative assembly of one of the great political parties, or one in which sharp differences of opinion are thrashed out, would be unnecessary even in global war. But the present result, it would appear, might have been achieved as well by a mail ballot.

In saying this we do not wish to play any favorites. The same may possibly apply equally to the Democratic Convention.

Victory in Canada

There are several important conclusions, for Americans as well as Canadians, to be drawn from the overwhelming victory of the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation in the Province of Saskatchewan. The CCF, which is frankly a party with a socialist program, made an amazing sweep. It jumped from 11 seats to at least 43, perhaps more. From 38 votes the Liberals have been cut down to only three or four, with several contests still in doubt as we write. The former Conservatives, now the Progressive-Conservatives, apparently did not win a single seat. The soldier vote, not yet counted, will go heavily in favor of the CCF. That party, which is far to the Left, now controls one province and is the official opposition in two others, Quebec and Ontario.

The Liberals made a campaign in Saskatchewan reminiscent of the one which the Republicans are now making in the United States. They talked about the CCF as "wild radicalism" and tending to "dictatorship." The Canadian press, like our own, was in most cases strongly anti-CCF. It belittled the chances of the party, failed to prepare its readers for the result and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thereby made the triumph all the greater. The CCF may have a strong plurality, if not an actual majority, in the next national Parliament. Indeed, the Mackenzie King government is now manifestly afraid to call a federal election. The people of Canada evidently want a strongly progressive national regime.

Three Primaries Coming Up

With the national spotlight centered on the Republican Convention in Chicago, voters in three states are preparing for primary elections in early July—Minnesota, Michigan and New Hampshire. In Minnesota, the union of the Farmer-Labor and Democratic Parties is now complete, from the top right down to the precincts. As a result, the opposition to the Republicans is stronger than it has been in years, and may demonstrate its strength in November. The way in which progressives in the Farmer-Labor and Democratic Parties have buried their differences and worked together should be an object lesson to other states.

Among these other states is Michigan, which sends some of the worst men to Congress. Here, we regret to report, neither the Democratic Party, the trade unions nor independent progressives have shown as yet the energy that they should.

New Hampshire is another state which illustrates the difficulties that labor and the progressives confront in many parts of the country. In the primaries, the chief fight is in the Republican Party between United States Senator Charles W. Tobey and Representative Foster Stearns. They both have bad records on domestic issues, but since Tobey is also an outstanding isolationist ("The Eastern Gerald Nye," he has been nicknamed), New Hampshire progressive Republicans will probably support Stearns. What we need, of course, is a progressive and labor movement throughout the country strong enough to have its own candidates everywhere.

Good News from Missouri

In recent months evidence of changing race relations has appeared in Missouri, a state by location and history pivotal for the country. Breaking all community precedents, St. Louis University, a Catholic institution, admitted five Negro students to its summer session. The St. Louis Board of Aldermen, by a vote of 22 to 4, tossed out an ancient Jim Crow edict which forbade serving Negroes in the lunchrooms of the city's public buildings. Although the new state constitution is being written by a "white-supremacy" convention, public pressure forced a minor concession which permits joint white-Negro schools by act of legislature should local districts request them.

At the University of Missouri recently in a scientifically weighted poll of 360 students, 61.6 percent favored the unrestricted admission of Negroes to the University; 77.5 percent favored the admission of Negroes either as regular students, as graduate students or as a students in professional schools. The student vote contrasts sharply with the court fights and various circumventions frequently undertaken by university authorities in various states on the assumption that the presence of Negro students would not be tolerated by the white student body.

Mr. Ford Was Wrong

On March 23, Henry Ford said that the war would be over in two months. It wasn't.

The Monetary Isolationists

THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE is fairly well inoculated against the type of political isolationism represented by The Chicago Tribune and The New York Daily News. The common sense of the people will prevent them from indulging the virulent Anglophobia typified by Colonel McCormick, because it is obvious that unless Britain and the United States hang together—to say nothing of Russia and China—it will be impossible to prevent new world wars. But there is another and more insidious form of isolationism which will be just as dangerous in the long run, and which is more likely to be accepted because it is embodied in conservative banking interests, is supported by traditional economists and now has as its principal spokes-

Mackenzie in The New York Post

Those Are Our Plans Too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man The New York Times, which is as respectable as a brownstone mansion of the nineties.

The rank and file of newspaper readers are not prepared to understand and criticize this brand of isolationism, because it deals with such abstruse technicalities as exchange rates and their control, the gold standard and the level of interest rates. In this respect the issue is the counterpart of the dispute over the payment of war debts, which bedeviled Anglo-American relations after the last war and in the end did a great deal to prevent the establishment of a sound world economy. We have, it is to be hoped, sidetracked that particular source of trouble this time by the invention of Lend-Lease. And, while serious in its results, it was never so explosive as the present difference, because in that case the conservative economists came to see the truth, and the immediate interests of many of the bankers lay on the side of compromise.

All concerned agree on the desirability of stable exchange rates and the lifting of barriers to foreign trade. The controversy rages at present chiefly over the means which shall be adopted to this end. The experts of the various nations, after long and careful discussion, have agreed upon a scheme for doing so, which is about to be laid before an official conference at Bretton Woods. If it is adopted there, it will be submitted to the several participating governments for final ratification. But this plan is under heavy attack by The Times and others, because in their view it is too favorable to Britain and runs counter to the interests of the United States. Disregarding technical details, we may explain the essence of the objection as follows.

The plan is supposed to be a substitute for the automatic international gold standard, which broke down before the war. According to this standard, the value of each currency was fixed in terms of gold, and therefore in terms of every other gold-standard currency. When payments into a given country exceeded those going out, operations in the exchange market would tend to raise the price of the currency most in demand —that is, the currency of the country receiving an excess of payments. But this price difference was limited by the fact that when the price of dollars, let us say, in terms of pounds, rose above a certain point, it would be cheaper for British debtors to Americans to ship gold than to pay any more dollars with pounds. That is, the price of dollars in gold, being fixed, plus the shipping charges of gold across the Atlantic, would become less than the rising price of dollars in pounds.

This scheme works satisfactorily as long as the balances of payments are not too large and do not run for too long in the same direction. When they do, gold in the paying nation or accessible to it is likely to run short. It must then forbid the export of gold and allow its currency to depreciate in terms of the currency of the creditor nation. The only alternative, barring default of debts, is for the creditor nation to extend loans to or make investments in—that is, to buy property from—the debtor nation. This temporarily may redress the unbalance of payments.

The gold standard broke down before the war largely because payments to the United States for long periods exceeded outgoing payments, and this country did not, after the oncoming of depression, make sufficient loans or investments abroad to make up the difference. We thus collected a lion's share of the world's gold, while one nation after another went off the international gold standard and depreciated its currency. The fact that we also depreciated ours only made their problems more serious, at least until joint Anglo-American exchange control was established.

The new plan is one for international exchange stabilization. Briefly, each participating nation will contribute to a fund, which will then be used when necessary to buy sagging currencies and keep them up to par. If the situation becomes too serious, the debtor country is to be allowed, within certain limitations, to devalue its currency and start all over again.

The objectors really want the gold standard back, although most of them admit the necessity for some kind of cushioning process, especially for the postwar transition. They are suspicious, however, of the use which the British and others may make of the proposed international agency and its stabilization fund. Naturally the United States, because of its great wealth and its hoards of gold, will be the principal contributor to the fund. It is most unlikely, however, that this nation will need to draw on it. The British, being in serious financial straits, may do so heavily. Thus, under the guise of the plan, this nation may be extending large loans to the British and others without, say the objectors, receiving anything in return. If loans are in order, they want them made by American private bankers and investors, who will thus be in a position to amass a great deal of wealth and power at the expense of the British.

But there is a more fundamental objection even than this. The dominant school of thought in Britain, represented by Lord Keynes, believes in seeking prosperity and full employment by a governmental fiscal policy of keeping interest rates low and making large public expenditures. The objectors do not believe in this policy and expect to prevent the United States from following it. If this country follows a deflationary course while Britain does the opposite, the two currencies are likely to fall out of line. Under the gold standard or any substitute which the objectors would approve, we might then be able to force deflation on Britain also, but under the new international plan Britain might be able to escape by depreciating her currency, and at the same time sustain her course by using the international fund to support it even at the new level. In that case we might have to abandon deflation, with its high interest rates and governmental "economy." The ob-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jectors look on the British idea as downright immoral, and regard with a paranoid horror the possibility that we might be tied to it through any international stabilization plan.

There is not the slightest possibility of converting dominant British opinion to the position of our objectors in these matters. (For a report of the British view, see Richard Lee Strout's article on page 9 of this issue.) As a result of carrying on alone the heavy burden of the struggle against the Axis until we began to intervene, they have lost a large part of their foreign investments. The earnings from these were essential to maintain even as favorable a balance of payments as Britain enjoyed before the war. British property interests do not intend to mortgage all their wealth to American bankers and investors in order to maintain exchange stability after the war, nor do they wish to be compelled to worsen their position by accepting large loans from American private interests at high rates of interest.

The British public, in its turn, is going to insist on a full-employment economy, no matter what reactionary control is exercised in the United States, or what economic blunders we make. Economists like Lord Keynes have recommended an expansionist economic policy for all countries; if it were followed internationally, few of the difficulties foreseen by the American objectors would arise. British currency would probably not require much support from the fund, and Britain would not be obliged to devalue. But the British have little confidence that this country will not fall under the control of the short-sighted economic reactionaries. If it does, they do not intend to be tied to our chariot wheel.

The American objectors will doubtless be surprised to be called isolationists, since according to orthodox theory the gold standard is supposed to be the essence of economic internationalism, along with low tariffs and unobstructed trade. Nevertheless they are seeking to impose their will as to economic policy on the British and other nations by means of the gold standard, and to exact from the British the pound of flesh which may become due as a result of Britain's war sacrifices in the common cause. They insist on "America First" in monetary and fiscal matters.

The New Republic opposes them, not because we place British interests above American, but because we believe that the policy which Britain intends to follow is the best for the people of both countries and for the world. In addition, the economic disunion which stubborn resistance to the British on this point is certain to cause will poison any peace, no matter what its political basis. We are not ready to sacrifice full employment and international tranquillity on the altar of those who want to make money out of high interest rates, or of those who believe a country can prosper by importing gold to bury in the ground.

The White-Collar Worker

STORM CLOUDS of righteous indignation have arisen from unexpected quarters over the plight of the "white-collar" worker, caught between the rising cost of living and allegedly stationary wages. These give rise to some suspicion, since they emanate from certain congressmen and newspapers that are not generally known as friends of wage earners or salaried workers.

One recent flurry of concern over the white-collar worker was precipitated by two articles in The New York Times by the veteran labor reporter, Louis Stark. He estimated that there are perhaps 15 million workers in this category who have not, for the most part, received even the benefits of the "Little Steel" formula because they are not organized and therefore have no method of presenting their needs to the War Labor Board. Mr. Stark seemed to imply that as a matter of national policy employers should be required to give the 15-percent increase permitted by the Little Steel formula, instead of doing so on a voluntary basis, an idea with considerable merit.

The New York Times's editorial staff, however, gave the material quite a different slant. It was used, first of all, as a further justification for The Times's campaign lambasting the War Labor Board. Second, The Times's editorials attributed the plight of the white-collar workers to the increases obtained by organized factory workers, on the ground that these increases were primarily responsible for the rise in cost of living. Shortly thereafter, the problem was taken up by Senator Pepper's Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education. Hearings were held and voluminous testimony taken. Measured in concrete aid to white-collar workers, the result has been exactly nil so far, but in tending to engender an attitude of hostility to organized labor on the part of white-collar workers and the community in general, there has been some success which will probably be exploited further during the coming political campaign.

As is usual in such situations, the controversy failed to produce agreement even as to the identity of its subject—the white-collar workers. Their number is, to a considerable degree, a matter of definition. In some discussions, the term is used as almost synonymous with "the middle class," and includes independent professionals, persons living on pensions, and even small merchants and employers. Such a definition obviously has no significance in a discussion of wage policy and the term should at least be restricted to salaried workers.

Unfortunately, the present number of such individuals is not known. The 1940 census of population which gives their prewar distribution reported approximately 45 million employed workers, of whom about 11 millions fell into the two major white-collar categories—professional and semi-professional workers and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those in clerical, sales and similar work. While it is true that white-collar workers, however defined, are not so well organized as factory workers, it is misleading to set up a sharp contrast between white-collar workers as "unorganized" and the factory workers as "organized." Millions of factory workers are unorganized; an increasing proportion of white-collar workers are organized. Both the AFL and the CIO have a considerable number of unions with jurisdiction primarily or exclusively in white-collar industries or occupations. A number of industrial unions include white-collar workers.

Undoubtedly, salaried workers have not increased their weekly earnings during the war period as much as wage earners have. The lag of white-collar earnings is due, in large part, to the fact that their hours of work have not been increased to the same extent as those of factory workers. Such limited data as are available indicate that certain white-collar groups have not lagged far behind factory workers in increases in hourly rates of pay. But even if they had kept up with wage earners, they would not be able to maintain their prewar standards of living. If we accept the rise of approximately 25 percent given in the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor statistics, the increased burden of taxes and the average deduction for bonds mean that something like a 40 to 60-percent increase in weekly earnings is necessary to maintain prewar living standards. Millions of wage earners, as well as white-collar employees, have failed to receive increases of this magnitude. There are also many thousands of wage earners whose hours have not been increased and who are therefore in about the position of the white-collar workers. Worse off than both these groups are individuals living on fixed incomes, such as pensions or allotments to dependents of servicemen. There is not even a Little Steel formula for millions of such individuals.

Though many white-collar workers have not received the increase provided by the Little Steel formula, the War Labor Board is not to blame, as The New York Times and others have suggested. The group of white-collar workers who are undoubtedly the worst off are the more than three million federal, state and local government workers—school teachers, librarians and clerks—whose wages are completely outside the jurisdiction of the WLB. Others are professional and administrative workers whose wage increases are controlled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Certain features of the War Labor Board's policy tend to favor white-collar workers rather than wage earners. For example, it is usually not necessary to obtain approval for wage raises granted pursuant to a plan which provides increases on the basis of "merit" or "length of service." Such plans are much more common in the white-collar fields than in factory employment. The Board has generally exempted from wage control establishments employing eight individuals or fewer. This exemption is most significant in the retail and service industries, which, between them, employ about five million white-collar workers. Many of these are paid on a commission basis so that their earnings go up in proportion to their sales.

Though the individual unorganized worker cannot take his case to the War Labor Board, the individual employer may request Board approval of wage increases falling within appropriate categories, regardless of whether or not his employees are organized. The reports of the War Labor Board to the Senate show that approximately three out of every four voluntary applications filed with the Board did not involve unions. If it is true, as alleged, that the Board's forms have deterred employers of white-collar workers from filing, it may be argued that white-collar workers should organize in order to obtain the benefit of our federal wage policy, since their employers will not take advantage of these opportunities. In many instances, wage increases granted to white-collar workers are a direct result of increases previously granted to factory workers.

In any event, white-collar workers can solve their problems not by opposing organized labor but by joining organizations which are earnestly attempting to represent their interests. This is not, to be sure, the conclusion suggested by The New York Times and other groups who are weeping over the plight of white-collar workers.

A recent attempt has been made to organize white-collar workers outside the affiliated labor movement, because of an alleged need for a bulwark against organized labor and organized agriculture. We must certainly give serious thought to the problems of all individuals who are suffering unduly as a result of wartime conditions; but there are implications in the special concern expressed over white-collar workers—whether sincerely or not—which need to be considered and counteracted.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Isles and Bretton Woods

In The New Republic of June 12 we published a cabled dispatch from London, by Michael Young, reporting the remarkable new proposals of the British government for a compensatory economy. In the article below, Richard Lee Strout, a member of the Washington staff of The Christian Science Monitor who is now stationed in London, continues the discussion with a report of possible conflicts between British and American policies. – THE EDITORS

FOR THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS factories have periodically poured out more goods than the public could buy. Gluts occurred which resulted in great depressions, of which the most catastrophic was that of 1929. Standard economic theory was that these gluts, panics or depressions must be endured in silence till the law of supply and demand set in. If factories stayed closed long enough, if enough people went cold and hungry, then stockpiles would ultimately be absorbed, employment would revive and Bill Smith wouldn't have to sell apples any longer on the street-corner.

Now this is changed. In an epochal White Paper, issued just prior to the Bretton Woods conference on monetary problems in America, Britain has formally junked the theory of scarcity economics. In a topsy-turvy world that coincides with the invasion of Europe, Britain has in effect announced that depressions don't have to occur, and has officially accepted governmental responsibility for seeing that they don't.

This decision raises possible complications in international monetary affairs and in Anglo-American postwar trade relations. But first let us dwell on the implications themselves. Here are three illustrations:

1. When Hoover fought Roosevelt in 1932, the economic debate turned largely on government's ability to prevent or halt depressions. Mr. Hoover, in general, advocated a hands-off attitude. Now the predominantly conservative British wartime coalition officially repudiates that view.

2. At almost the same time, in 1929, the conservative British Treasury, through the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, ridiculed and rejected Lloyd George's proposal for a billion dollars' worth of public works to counterbalance depressions: economic storms, it said, must run their course. Now this "orthodox" philosophy is unanimously scrapped by all parties in Britain, to the universal commendation of the British press.

3. A year ago the now defunct National Resources Planning Board in Washington issued a report, prepared largely by Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard, arguing that full employment must henceforth be the responsibility of the state, and outlining the Keynesian controls for achieving this end, which epitomize modern economic thinking. Conservative Senators, led by Tydings, McKellar, Taft and others, competed with one another in ridiculing the proposals, and their assault on the report spelled its doom and killed the NRPB. But these proposals which were rejected by the American Congress are now officially proclaimed the keystone of British postwar economic policy.

I cite these examples to illustrate that this is no cloistered academic question, but perhaps the liveliest political subject of our time. It will be debated for a generation. It may also unfortunately align the United States to some degree against Britain and it will be interesting to observe the Bretton Woods conference from this aspect.

Here is the postwar cleavage in a nutshell: Centralized governments like Russia and Germany have long since imposed airtight economic controls and almost certainly will continue in that direction after the war. Great Britain is now apparently persuaded that controls to equalize the business cycle can be reconciled with political democracy and has taken the plunge. But in the United States the trend of opinion is away from any conscious economic management. This difference of approach is likely to have repercussions of great magnitude in years to come.

The British step, from the American viewpoint, seems far more drastic than it does to the inhabitants of this tight little kingdom. The conservative Daily Telegraph was at some pains to explain that the White Paper is neither "revolutionary" nor "socialistic." Most of the papers take it eagerly but calmly. It is simply common sense, they affirm. Their attitude illustrates the unconscious revolution in men's thinking that has come with the war. The indignant rejection of similar proposals in Lloyd George's time has already been noted. War commonly speeds up evolution of weapons and engineering, but rarely of economic thinking. Yet in this instance, and in the lifetime of one man, John Maynard Keynes, the greatest economic pioneer of his day, a supposed "law" has been publicly repudiated.

I listened to Lord Woolton and Ernest Bevin, respectively Minister of Reconstruction and Labor, expound the new theory. The urbane, distinguished big business man, Woolton, and the burly labor leader Bevin, who drops every other "h," were in complete accord. England in 1870 decided that illiteracy would have to go. Over succeeding years, they explained, illiteracy was banished. Now, in 1944, in just as profound a decision, England has resolved that unemployment must go. Britain may not achieve this in one bill, but the pattern has been set. The pattern is through an expansionist economy, the acceptance of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government responsibility in the matter, and specifically the willingness to supplement private with public expenditure, at the appearance of a slump.

That is the key to the matter—expenditure. Sir William Beveridge points here to the recognition of the crucial fact that "the volume of employment depends on the volume of expenditure." Private industry will be given the chance to keep up its share of the volume of expenditure. But if the proposed new government economic GHQ, which is to be set up, sees a sign of a slump, then all the government fire alarms will be rung at once and half a dozen major conduits will start pumping in additional purchasing power in unison from government reserves. It is underlined again and again in the White Paper that the critical point in preventing a slump is to catch it at the very outset. All Mr. Roosevelt's billions of public works never caught up to the terrible 1929 crash once it had started, though the expenditure of a small fraction of the money at the beginning might have averted the whole economic storm. (A storm incidentally that swept round the world, and by deepening unemployment in Germany did much to produce Hitler.)

Where does all this fit in with the Bretton Woods conference on monetary matters?

The point here is that, in the words of The (London) Economist, "the currency proposals are only the occasion for the dispute, and not its substance." The New Hampshire conference will be the first test, but by no means the final and decisive one, of how nations which are consciously planning to manage their postwar economy will get on with the nations (specifically the United States) which don't.

An agreement on an elastic international monetary system is pretty important for every nation. The Bretton Woods gathering is likely to work out some acceptable formula. There will be disputes, but all the time, as British opinion sees it, the disputes will really not be over the question of money, *per se*, but over the deeper problem of postwar trade. A good deal of diplomatic tact may be used to prevent public facing of this issue. Nevertheless, the money end is primarily the question of how to make payment. The big problem is how the buying and selling shall be arranged in the first place.

A key feature of Britain's present economic discussion of her relations with America is worry lest the United States have another 1929 slump. I sometimes think that British economists pay more attention to this than Americans do. I think it is fair to say that it is pretty well agreed over here that America will have such a slump if she doesn't take appropriate precautions, and from the British watchtower no such precautions are yet discernible. This worry by one nation over the internal affairs of another seems amusing in one sense, until you realize that America is a mainspring that makes the clocks of most of the other nations keep time. In 1929 America exported unemployment to practically all the world.

On one thing Britain is resolved. She is going to insulate herself from another American economic paroxysm. This will show itself at the monetary conference in Britain's reluctance to tie herself too closely to America's gold standard. Later on it may cause sharp difficulties when individual American exporters run up against competition in which British or other foreign governments play a part.

American firms will roundly denounce this "governmental competition." In so far as this covers only the bad features of international cartels, they will have a case. But on the other hand, the postwar international trade, outside of the United States, is almost certainly going to be government-supervised to an increasing degree. "It is the purest common sense," says The Economist, "that those countries that are taking effective steps to prevent depressions within their own borders should be allowed to protect themselves and to join together to protect each other against the import of unemployment from other countries that have either neglected their duty, or have been unsuccessful in their efforts."

The sum and substance is that at a number of points the practice of international trade, monetary or otherwise, will have to be adjusted to the new doctrine of full employment. Britain's determination to banish mass idleness will not only be a constant ideological challenge to the United States from now on, particularly as it takes gradual form in specific bills. This same type of challenge has occurred before, for compact, homogeneous, highly industrialized Britain has consistently led the United States in trade-union development and social legislation by a matter of 20 or 30 years. But now the difference between the two countries touches economic dogma, and may find expression in practical matters, like international currency, preferences, quotas, tariffs and the like.

Some Englishmen, I am afraid, are going to be tempted to make their country's social foresight regarding employment an excuse for seeking selfish tariff action and imperial preference.

But one thing is fairly certain. The world trend toward conscious economic management and full production is not going to let America alone. No, not even if Congress passes a law against it. First Russia and Germany adopted it, and though we didn't like it in its totalitarian form, we couldn't deny its terrific effect. Then Britain and America were forced to adopt it in the war and discovered for themselves the astonishing output that can be achieved by all-out production that takes no stock of profits. Now Britain has made the revolutionary announcement that she believes this new economy (in part at least) can be reconciled to the democratic form, and that she never intends to go back to the old days of mass unemployment and closed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factories. If private British industry can keep the factories open, so much the better; but if there is any sign of flagging or failure the government will step in, besides lending a guiding hand at all times.

Such a program from Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal would of course bring the charges of "radical" and "socialist." In England the criticism comes in large part from those who feel it does not go far enough. Sir William Beveridge asks whether capital expenditure can be made sufficiently stable "while it remains mainly in private hands." Yet he sees in the White Paper "the beginning of a voyage to a better world."

This is the mood in Britain, in the midst of the invasion, as she sends delegates to the world monetary conference at Bretton Woods.

London RICHARD LEE STROUT

The People's Stake in Radio

THE NATIONAL ADVERTISERS whose broadcasts consume very nearly all the precious evening air time of the principal networks are probably unfamiliar with those provisions of the 1934 Radio Act which make it mandatory that licensees of radio frequencies operate their facilities in the "public interest, convenience and necessity." Their basic concern is to increase the sale of the breakfast foods, drugs, soaps and cigarettes they manufacture by extolling the virtues of their products in the course of broadcasts designed to attract mass audiences.

However, it is very much our concern to consider how radio-station owners, who pay nothing to the government for their licenses to traffic with the people's airwaves, are carrying out their explicit promise to use them in the "public interest, convenience and necessity."

Mr. Edgar Kobak, executive vice-president of the Blue Network, in the course of a recent address delivered at Ohio State University, succinctly stated the relationship of the radio industry to the public. "Our air belongs to the people," he said, "and we are the trustees." If our "trustees" were effectively operating in the public interest this miraculously potent channel of mass communication, it is doubtful whether we should now find that 75 percent of the people do not know what a price subsidy is; that less than a third know how a peace treaty is approved; that 60 percent of the people have not heard or have not read of the Atlantic Charter; and that 63 percent of the people do not know that we are receiving reverse Lend-Lease from Great Britain. These startling findings of fact are contained in a report of Hadley Cantrell, director of Public Opinion Research of Princeton University, published in The New York Times several months ago.

Manifestly, our radio broadcasters are not creating an informed public by catapulting capsuled headline news at them all day and evening. The people are informed only when the public issues that intimately affect their lives are the subject of public discussion, with leaders of all shades of thought and opinion participating therein. We can understand why Mr. Justice Brandeis, speaking for the Supreme Court in the case of Whitney v. Seymour, fourteen years ago, said, "Public discussion is a public duty, and this should be a fundamental principle of the American government."

Public-discussion programs that stimulate constructive thought, programs of information and of enlightenment mean little if broadcast at times of the day when most of the nation's radio sets are silent. Yet, because the sale of the evening hours of air time is such a profitable source of revenue to the radio industry, it is rare indeed for a public-interest program to find its way upon any leading network between the hours of 7:30 and 11 p. m., when the greatest number of radio listeners are at home. Presumably, it is for this reason that a sustaining program such as "Invitation to Learning" is broadcast at 11:30 in the morning, while the commercially sponsored "It Pays to Be Ignorant" is broadcast at nine o'clock at night over almost an entire network of stations.

No one can take exception to the advertisers' use of the facilities they rent from the networks for the broadcast of programs of mass audience appeal; they must ensure that their "commercials" reach maximum audiences, else they cannot afford the high cost of radio advertising. However, proper and often very patient criticism of the radio industry for remission of its public responsibilities has sometimes met with curious recriminations.

Some segments of the radio industry have retorted with demands that their business operations be freed from the shackles of what they term "bureaucratic" government interference; others cite the First Amendment, with its resounding guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly to the people of the United States. Yet today, freedom of speech in radio broadcasting, so far as the bulk of the public is concerned, means in effect the right of a station operator to use the people's airwaves to restrain free speech, to channel it, to limit it, to offer it to those who can induce a sponsor to pay for it and to deny it to those who cannot.

Furthermore, radio has removed the place of assembly, within the meaning of the First Amendment, from the town halls and public squares of yesterday into the living rooms of today. For what is said in New York's Town Hall to a few hundred people, or in a public

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

square in Jersey City, is scarcely important. But what is spoken into a transmitter and carried over the people's airwaves from the Town Halls of the Air into the living rooms of America is of paramount importance. If the champions of thought in America, representing majorities or sizable minorities, are not given free and regular access to the people's airwaves, at times convenient to the listening public, thus to discuss the pressing issues of the day in the living-assembly-rooms of America, then we are seriously abridging free speech and free assembly within the plain intent of the First Amendment.

Of course, it is not possible to blame any individual network entirely for its failure to reserve some small portion of the people's best radio time for the broadcast of sustaining programs directed to their vital interests. Networks must compete for the choice affiliated stations, not in terms of providing the finest evening sustaining programs, but in terms of assuring to these radio stations maximum advertiser revenue. So the networks, under their contracts with affiliates, while exercising the right to compel these stations to broadcast commercially sponsored programs, do not attempt to require them to broadcast non-commercial public-service programs.

And even when NBC broadcasts its popular sustaining program, "The Chicago Round Table," at an hour unattractive to advertisers, *viz.*, 1:30 in the afternoon, we find that more than 60 percent of its affiliated stations do not carry it. And it is only because The Reader's Digest has agreed to sponsor the "Town Hall" program that more than 50 radio stations which had refused to broadcast it on a sustaining basis will now be obliged by contract to carry this commendable program.

Certainly the leaders of the radio industry would be the last to quarrel with the proposition that the incredible ignorance of the American people on the vital issues with which their lives are now intimately identified must be relieved as promptly as possible. To this purpose, we call upon them as "trustees" of the people's airwaves to provide adequate time on the air for public discussion of basic controversial issues.

This does not mean that any of the popular programs which the national advertisers provide must be removed from the air, for it is only with their support that we can be assured that broadcasting can be maintained within our free-enterprise system. Furthermore, by their highly entertaining programs, national advertisers attract the very audiences to whom can be most effectively beamed programs of information, enlightenment and public discussion. If a program such as "The Chicago Round Table" were to be broadcast in the evening over the entire NBC network of some 145 stations during the half-hour between the Jack Benny and Charlie McCarthy programs, it would be heard by an audience several thousand times greater than the number of listeners it now reaches. Similarly, if programs of public discussion were sandwiched between such popular broadcasts as the Fibber McGee and Bob Hope programs, or between "The Aldrich Family" and the Bing Crosby program, they would reach a large proportion of this vast audience. For radio research indicates that a substantial percentage of listeners do not turn off their sets during the half-hour span between two highly popular programs.

Perhaps it is too much to ask the "trustees" of our airwaves to devote one-seventh of the best evening hours to the people, the beneficiaries of the trust. We ought to be well satisfied if each network is obliged to provide, and all its affiliates obliged to broadcast or rebroadcast, each evening between the hours of 7:30 and 11, a 30-minute non-commercial radio program of public discussion, information and enlightenment. If each of the four networks provided such a half-hour program, we would have two hours of network time each evening directly dedicated to the public "interest," at times that are in the people's "convenience" and on issues of public "necessity."

Mr. William Paley, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, in testifying before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee a few years ago, pointed out that without network programs, affiliated stations would lose half of their income. On this basis, it would be reasonable to require affiliated network stations, in return for the right to broadcast highly profitable, commercially sponsored programs, to devote 30 minutes each evening to the broadcast of socially significant sustaining programs. Certainly, the allocation of less than 15 percent of their best evening time to the public interest is not an excessive payment to require of the operators of radio stations for the free grant of licenses to use the nation's airwaves.

The enormous value of this "gift" is emphasized by some recent sales of radio stations: The Washington Post paid $500,000 for Station WINX; The Philadelphia Bulletin, $600,000 for Station WPEN; Marshall Field purchased Station WJJD for $750,000; and The New York Times acquired WQXR for more than one million dollars. In each of these sales, by far the greater part of the purchase price represented, in effect, the value of a license to broadcast for which the original licensee paid nothing to the United States Government other than its promise to provide broadcasting service "in the public interest, convenience and necessity."

It will be recalled that after extended litigation, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the right of the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate rules governing the conditions under which radio stations might broadcast network programs. It is, therefore, here suggested that the FCC add to its existing network rules a provision requiring that all licensees of standard broadcast stations who option any of their evening hours to networks for the broadcast of com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercially sponsored programs, agree to broadcast or rebroadcast each evening of the week between 7:30 and 11 p. m., a half-hour sustaining, non-commercial program, to be provided by the network with which they are affiliated.

Nor should this proposed amendment to the network rules be indefinitely delayed. The cost of operation of the radio industry is going up. Such unions as the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Radio Artists and the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), from time to time demand and receive for their members increases in remuneration which are justified in varying degrees. The longer we wait, the more plausibility the radio chains will have in pleading that they cannot afford to devote evening hours to the public interest.

Moreover, if we do not provide criteria of public service under the present system of standard wave broadcasting, it is doubtful whether such yardsticks will be established with respect to FM, television and facsimile broadcasting, the commercial application of which is bound to increase rapidly in the postwar period. Without such safeguards, these new and revolutionary methods of radio communication will do little more than compete with the comic strip and motion picture for the leisure time of a listening public already overwhelmed by a plethora of light entertainment. Such a public cannot be expected to develop as an informed and thinking citizenry, without which a truly democratic government cannot survive. In the fateful words of Mr. Justice Brandeis: "The greatest menace to freedom is an inert people."

BERNARD B. SMITH

How Should We Attack Japan?

IN WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS, a periodical frequently used of late by the Soviet government as a vehicle for expression of its views on foreign affairs, there appeared a few days ago an article in which Japan was described as belonging to the Hitler coalition and therefore doomed to defeat. Those aware of the pains taken by the Russians, ever since Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, to preserve the correctness of their neutrality in the Pacific war and to avoid setting in motion a series of events which might lead to a *casus belli* will consider this statement highly significant. One might be excused for reading into this declaration a not too concealed intimation of Russia's intentions to enter the Pacific war. But at the very least it indicates that the Russians consider Japan's position in the war against the United States so worsened that they need no longer fear an attack by the Japanese.

As if to underscore the validity of the Russian evaluation of the Pacific situation, the Japanese home islands are bombed by B-29 Superfortresses from bases somewhere in China; Saipan in the Marianas is successfully invaded by American forces; and the Japanese fleet is mauled by our carrier-based planes in the Western Pacific. Saipan is not on the perimeter of Japan's far-flung outposts but is part of the inner fortress of Japan's sphere of defenses. While the greatest amphibious operations in history, to which America is contributing the greater part in men and materials, are proceeding on the continent of Europe, the United States has enough left of everything to bring the war home to another aggressor by air, sea and land 12,000 or so miles away. This is indeed global warfare, and only about two and a half years ago our nation began seriously to convert to war its industrial machine and manpower.

Consider the magnitude of these events as an indication of what has been accomplished and of tasks and victories to come.

In size, range, bomb-carrying capacity, protective armor and fire power these Superfortresses are the last word in instruments of strategic bombing. They are not improvised, but are the result of the long-standing policy of our air forces, which like our navy, have been Pacific-minded, and therefore demanded that bombers must have range to cover Pacific distances, must be able to do precision bombing on small targets, must have armor and fire power to protect themselves, because they operate at too long a range for fighter escort. We have been the beneficiaries of this policy in the European theatre of war, where we successfully introduced daylight bombing. We shall gather the full harvest of this policy in the vastnesses of the Pacific.

The strategic bombing of Japan will not prove abortive even if she continues her growing offensive in China and succeeds in capturing the bases from which the Superfortresses are operating. Because of their isolation, these bases in the India-China theatre are not of the best, for several gallons of gas must be used by the flying tankers to bring in one gallon for use on bombing missions. Saipan and nearby Guam, as well as the rest of the Marianas with the surrounding islands, furnish good bases for strategic bombing of Japan. They are about 1,400 miles from Tokyo, do not suffer from the bad climate which renders the Aleutians inferior as air bases, and above all can be easily supplied by surface tankers and freighters. Likewise, northward toward Japan there are a string of island stepping-stones, including the Bonin group, which may serve as auxiliary or intermediate air bases.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, in addition to strategic bombing, planes based on the Marianas could serve to cover our navy operating as far as the Philippines, 1,400 miles away,

And it is essential for us to proceed in that direction from Biak in the South Pacific and the Marianas in the Central Pacific, because the Marianas and the surrounding island groups are not large enough for an invasion base. The Philippines and Formosa are to Japan what England and North Africa are to Europe. They are big enough to contain large masses of men and material; they also have good harbors and a friendly population. Operating from these and the surrounding islands, our navy and air forces would paralyze Japan by severing sea communication between her home islands and the conquered East Indies. Formosa is about 250 miles from Luzon, some 650 miles from Nagasaki and 1,100 miles from Tokyo. Our air force, based on the Philippines, Formosa and the surrounding islands, could bomb the industrial heart of Japan. The Ryukyu islands between Formosa and Japan proper can also be utilized as stepping-stones for strategic and tactical bombing and for an invasion of Japan's homeland. Such an invasion would make it unnecessary to fight a prolonged and time-consuming land campaign on the Asiatic continent, which, even with the participation of Russia, might still require an invasion of Japan. It is important to preserve China as a stabilizing postwar power in the Far East, but for purely military reasons an extensive land campaign in China before invading Japan is not the most economical and expeditious use of our resources. The more the Japanese concentrate their land power on the Asiatic mainland to compensate for loss of their sea empire, the easier it should be to outflank that land power by invading the islands of Japan. With these conquered, the armies of the continent become atrophied limbs.

Particularly in a war of technologies, when armies must depend upon a constant stream of supplies and manpower, it is inconceivable that the Japanese forces on the mainland would be able to continue to fight after their homeland was conquered. It may be true that some plants, together with their workers, have been transferred from Japan to the Asiatic mainland to decentralize Japanese industry as some protection against air attacks. But these cannot make the armies there independent of Japan either in raw materials, munitions or industrial manpower. Japan has not reached that technological development where in the span of a few years she could build up a self-sufficient industrial system away from her homeland. Socio-political factors also militate against a last-ditch fight on the mainland. Where would help come from for a Japanese government in exile? With their homeland in our possession, we could quickly mop up any possible suicidal gesture of resistance.

To invade Japan, her navy must be destroyed or neutralized and driven off. Up to the invasion of the Marianas, ever since the naval battle of November, 1942, which decided the fate of Guadalcanal, the Japanese navy has chosen to leave its garrisons stranded on the various islands rather than risk engaging the ever growing American navy on the sea and in the air. Our island-hopping strategy has consisted of proceeding in the South Central Pacific from one key island to another, leaving the intermediate strong points neutralized by our air power. Tactically, the pattern consisted of bombings, by land-based planes, of the island to be invaded, then bombings by carrier-based air power, close-in shelling by task forces, and finally invasion. The Marianas invasion differed in this important respect: land-based planes were not used by us; all were carrier-based. Saipan is about 1,100 miles from Eniwetok, the westernmost of our outposts in the Marshalls, just within the outside limits of land-based bombers, exclusive of the B-29's.

Is that why the Japanese navy finally decided to oppose the invading forces around Saipan, to prevent America from acquiring a springboard for further advances in the Western Pacific? If so, the reception accorded the Japanese forces on June 18 and 19 soon caused their navy to revert to its role of seeking cover rather than to aim for decisive combat. The loss of 747 planes, carrier and land-based, as well as the sinking of several carriers and damage to other fleet units, as compared to our losses of 95 planes and minor damage to some of our ships, is important not so much for its absolute results but as a demonstration that even in the Western Pacific, with all the advantages of shorter lines of supply, Japan's navy is no match for ours. The initial key to the weakness of the Japanese navy is the demonstrated superiority of our carrier-based planes even to the Japanese land-based variety and the fact that our aircraft-carriers are so numerous (100, including baby flat tops, are in the Pacific) that we can marshal 1,000 planes in a single task force. It is worth noting that Major de Seversky's judgment that aircraft-carriers were obsolete has been proved wrong by the course of events.

The consequence of these events is that we can confidently continue our inexorable advance, and that the Japanese navy, even in its home waters, must continue to forgo battle or be destroyed. But even as an inactive "fleet in being," it will not be safe from surprises by our navy and air forces, land and carrier-based. The Japanese navy is growing progressively more unable to justify its reason for existence: protection of the Japanese lines of communication.

We can afford, in any naval battle, to lose ship for ship and still come out with a greater fleet than the one with which Japan entered the engagement. Japan cannot in this war catch up with our superior technology and industrial system. I believe it was Mr. Churchill who said nothing succeeds like excess.

JOSEPH ROSENFARB

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Jobs or Monopoly?

A POWERFUL BATTLE of the most immediate importance to every American is raging inside the War Production Board over who will control the American economy in the transition to peace. The decisions to be made by the small group of men who comprise the board will be almost as significant as the decision the American people will make in November. Whether men are to have jobs will depend on the decisions of the WPB. The type of economic development we are to have in the next generation will be determined by who wins out in the tremendous struggle that is now being waged.

It is essentially the same fight that has been fought from the beginning of the defense program. In the early days when the country was trying to arm itself in the shortest possible time, the same forces of monopoly and high finance fought for control of the governmental machinery. There was sufficient steel on hand, they said, sufficient aluminum, sufficient electric power and even enough chrome for fancy plating on automobiles. Do nothing to interfere with business-as-usual as practised by the great industrialists, they cried; do nothing to disturb the status quo. Now it is the same cry. Do nothing that will prevent us from recapturing our old hold on the civilian economy. Do nothing to upset the prewar competitive relationships. Let civilians wait for new products and let men be idle if necessary, but remember that monopoly is holy.

It is strange, but true, that the most progressive voice in this fight is that of Donald M. Nelson, WPB chairman. The influence of Franklin D. Roosevelt is on the side of Charles E. Wilson, WPB executive vice-chairman, and the powerful banking and industrial forces that support him. At the moment, Nelson is on top, but his position is by no means secure. Wilson's resignation is said to have been submitted and it is further said that he will remain in the WPB only if Nelson is ousted. Early this year Wilson's resignation was accepted by Nelson but refused by the President. The White House argued, apparently, that it was better to let the big industrialists, who are handling the bulk of the war orders, have their way than to think too much about the political and economic implications of what they are doing. In an unusual display of cordiality, the President poured praise upon Wilson's head. In a letter to Gerard Swope, president of General Electric, from which Wilson is on leave, Mr. Roosevelt wrote that "it is really essential to the conduct of the war that Charlie Wilson remain with the government until next summer."

That action by the President substantially increased Wilson's prestige and influence in the WPB. Some highly placed Democrats even talked about him as a possible vice-presidential nominee, and from then on Wilson and the WPB vice-chairmen, who are responsible to him, ran roughshod over Nelson. Once, when Nelson was out of the city, they formally withdrew an important decision already announced by him. On other occasions they have effectively sabotaged his decisions by refusing to carry them out. For example, the WPB announced that if a plant had the labor and materials and no war orders, it could manufacture certain essential civilian items even though in the past it might not have done so. It was the last part of the ruling that especially angered the Wilson group. So they went to work to nullify it. When Nelson found out that they were refusing to issue the necessary papers to validate the original order he had to intervene to overrule his own subordinates.

In the last few weeks Nelson has fought back vigorously against the Wilson crowd, which also has the support of the military group headed by Forrestal, Bard and Patterson, with Baruch as an ally. Nelson won a signal victory when, after several rough-and-tumble battles, he was able to announce that the big stockpiles of magnesium and aluminum would be used, to some extent at least, for essential civilian products, and Nelson boldly added that if the old competitive relationships were disturbed it was just too bad. Big capital is behind the big corporations that will not be able to reconvert until the war work is virtually completed. Those forces do not want any reconversion to begin until all can begin at once. If great surpluses of steel and aluminum are built up in the meantime, so much the better.

What they do not stop to realize is that unless reconversion is started early there will be vast unemployment even before the end of the war and even vaster unemployment in the months that follow. Suppose, for example, that after Paris is taken, the War Department cuts its orders by 10 percent; that would mean unemployment for approximately 3,000,000 industrial workers. If small business is allowed to remain in existence it can be a short absorber and provide civilian work for many of those persons, and it can help keep the economy on an even keel. Furthermore, it can challenge the great monopolists—and the monopolists know it. So they hide behind the patriotic cloak of wanting only war work, and let the civilian go hang.

The position of the President is consistent with the one he took in June, 1940, when he decided to ask "Big Bill" Knudsen to run the defense program. It has been to let industry run its own show with very few strings attached. The sordid story of the early defense days is well known to most persons, but this new chapter is not so familiar. It may not even be known to the President, for Nelson does not run to him with his problems, and others who have tried to see FDR have been unable to get into the White House. But the President must take a hand now that Wilson again has decided to place the matter before him.

Notes: Vice President Wallace's fight for the nomination is going to be even more difficult than his friends had expected. Unless he comes back from China and Siberia having made a great and obvious success, he will have an uphill battle all the way. The party politicians are stronger than ever against him. FDR remains loyal, but no one knows whether he will risk a real fight. . . . Our relations with Iceland have improved so much in the last two years that the OWI has withdrawn its bureau from Reykjavik. Americans were extremely unwelcome at first. The results are high tribute to the American forces there and to the OWI. . . . Paul Porter, successor to the Democratic Party's Charlie Michelson as publicity chief, is credited with having written some telling speeches against Dewey. Porter is one of the few men in the party headquarters

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization who is a New Dealer. . . . The betting in Washington as of this writing is that the President will be reëlected, but many administration supporters admit they are worried. . . . Cissie Patterson's Washington Times-Herald screamed with horror over the expulsion of Hjalmar Procope, the Finnish Minister. He was a great pal of the anti-Roosevelt isolationists.

Washington T. R. B.

Three New Ones

A LOWER-BUDGETED, gimcracked renewal of the gangster films, called "Roger Touhy, Gangster," is more than mildly underdone on a number of its sides. The characterization of the gang is in the one-sentence notation department, and the notations are as indifferently conventional as the invariable fact about cowboy films that the hero's buddy is always comical and decrepit. One member of the gang (Victor McLaglen) has a passion for learning, another (Frank Jenks) for "a girl named Daisy" and a third (Horace McMahon) for alcohol. The one exception in the general void of characterization is an instance of well marked sadism when Touhy (Preston Foster) beats up a henchman for drinking. Documentation about the gang's career seems to have been out of the research department's reach, except for an unaccountably well detailed enactment of their prison break. The acting, aside from Preston Foster's ever reliable surliness, proceeds by fits and starts and as though the performances had been given for different directors and different pictures. Along with some very nostalgic reminders of the old gangster films, such as transportation in careening sedans and communication by snarls, the film has two mild virtues. The first is that though it has very little of anyone's life, none of it is as glorified as the lives of super love, adventure and bravery that Cagney, Muni and Robinson spent in earlier, and better, gangster films. The second is that the director cut in some good, actual film shot at Stateville Prison in Joliet, which is grim and chilling enough to put the fear of prison into any lawbreaker.

"Two Girls and a Sailor" is a sweet-toothed bargain of about 18 vaudeville acts, none of which is very good or very bad but is stuffed for the occasion with cutenesses, to go with a story about two sisters who are in love with the same millionaire sailor. The sisters, Gloria DeHaven and June Allyson, do a lot of grown-up movie things like dancing in night clubs, chasing Latin lovers and holding private servicemen's canteens in their apartment after working hours, which would be about five in the morning, looking all the time as if they should either be home or with Gus Edwards' Kiddie Revue. The people around them, who impersonate sailors, grandfathers and orchestra leaders, are necessarily made to look like kindly fathers or kid brothers. One average sailor, chosen at random, would produce the same effect in this picture as one of these sailors would on a battleship. The quality is a curious one that its producer—Joe Pasternak—gets by having teen-age girls play grown-up roles as if they were playing house, which allows him to hit the cute, wholesome side of sweetness. There is also his ability to interlock vaudeville and story in a nice way, to make them both more humanly palatable than they are in a lot of other musicals, and to turn people like orchestra leaders into actors.

The latest Signal Corps film, "Attack," does a good, important job of showing the technique of invasion as it progressed from the first moment it was decided to obtain a landing place on the western tip of New Britain Island, to a time when the two objectives, Arawe and Port Gloucester, had been captured and American forces were pushing further inland. It is a couple of reels longer than either "Tarawa" or "Memphis Belle," less intense, and has a more polite, manicured look. "Attack" shows the war better than you will find it shown in films of pure entertainment and an amphibious operation better than you will find it in any of the newsreel accounts that have been shown so far of the landings in France. It pictures the thousand and one operations involved in such invasions; there are some grim shots of the destroyer Bronson's survivors being rescued, and some others just as grim when a jungle rainstorm swamped the landing craft. All along there is a good commentary delivered by a good Bogart-like voice. MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

"Everything is going much better than had been anticipated," he [Brigadier-General Edgar Erskine Hume, an AMG commander in Italy] said, "but the problem of what to do with the Fascists, against whom many people have believed this war was directed, remains unsolved." – *Edd Johnson in The Chicago Sun.*

We should not think that we have been passively attacked, but that we have actively pulled the enemy toward us. – *Japanese broadcast commenting on the raid of B-29's, quoted in The New York Times.*

It isn't generally known, but Winston Churchill has a nice job waiting when he retires as Prime Minister. He made a deal with Alex Korda for Metro—to write the history of England. – *From Hedda Hopper's syndicated column.*

Haven't You Forgotten Someone?

A rabid dog belonging to D. N. Cunningham, who lives near Purcellville, after biting two children and a colored man on Friday, attacked a horse and a hog before it was killed. The dog's head was examined and found positive. According to officials, the dog had not been vaccinated against rabies. The children are receiving the anti-rabies treatment. It was learned here that the horse will also be given treatment against the disease. – *From The Loudoun (Va.) News.*

Total-War Department

The United States War Department, looking ahead to the time when American troops may have leisure hours in France, advises them, in a thirty-six-page booklet distributed on the Normandy beachhead, to give the women a hand with the housework. "French women still talk about how your fathers did," it states. – *AP dispatch from London.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY

Correspondence

The Paper Shortage

SIR: It came to me as a distinct shock to read that the rising subscription list of The New Republic would actually have to be curtailed by a paper shortage. All these years I have thought that if only the American people would read The New Republic as well as the daily paper (*free* to print only one and often distorted side of the news), democracy might have a chance. This past year especially I have again and again expressed the wish for more readers for The New Republic. And now you could have them, but no paper.

I think back a couple of years to the time when the American press refused to coöperate to avoid a paper shortage. I think of the big fat Sunday issues full of unreadable trash and of the full-page advertisements filling half the ordinary daily papers. And I just boil over. The New Republic uses such a tiny bit of paper each week. The OPA should find some more just method than a percentage of last year's use.

Bemidji, Minn. CLARA F. WATSON

American Foreign Policy

SIR: What's been going on in Greece? Same old shell-game, probably; same old characters wearing different whiskers. But the real story must be in why the censorship, and by whom, and if our government acquiesces in it. . . .

I submit that our foreign policy is clear as crystal, and very, very bad. I submit that there is nothing complicated about it, except perhaps the devious diplomatic methods by which it is conducted and the obfusc diplomatic language which alibis it. If you go by the results—and what else is there to go by?—it is plain as anything. We're up to no good. We're out to lick the German army without in any way disturbing fascism, so as to impose a quarantine on Russia again. To do it, we shall have to ally ourselves with world fascism; whereas if we meant to get along with Russia, we could keep our democracy and even improve it.

Where have we supported democracy against fascism? Italy? Greece? China? France? Yugoslavia? If you think Germany is going to have any trouble getting a compromise peace from us, ponder the Father Orlemansky affair; the Montgomery Ward affair; the Standard-IG Farben affair, etc. And don't permit yourself to be too cheered by Dies's retirement—there are still all the people who made Dies possible. Our loans to Salazar and Ramirez, our oil to Franco—what's hard to understand about that, or complicated? Why are Juin and Georges commanding the French armies? Why are we training French officers here to "administer" France when North Africa is jammed with loyal Frenchmen? Why does Hull deny with such vehemence that we will deal with "the Vichy government"? We didn't deal with the "Mussolini government" either, but we didn't need to.

If we want our foreign policy changed, we shall first have to recognize it for what it is—a policy to support fascism as a counterweight to Sovietism. We shall have to become fascist ourselves, in the process. We're already making good progress—the soldiers disfranchised; the Negro and the poor white swindled out of their vote; Ward's being driven as a wedge between labor and capital; anti-Semitism rampant; the Catholics being split off by Orlemansky on the one hand and Coughlin on the other; the Poles, the Irish, the Greeks and the Yugoslavs being splintered off from the rest of us by a whole series of phony issues—there you have all the ingredients for American fascism. And in Spain, in Vichy, in Italy and the Vatican, and indeed where not? are American fascism's present and future allies.

Oshkosh, Wis. MRS. I. E. THOMPSON

Minnesota's State Teachers' College Board

SIR: In fairness to the Minnesota State Teachers' College Board and Dr. Charles R. Sattgast, Captain, United States Army, European Civil Affairs, now serving in England, will you kindly correct a misstatement of fact in Mr. Williams' article [on Governor Stassen] in your June 5 issue?

Dr. Sattgast did not resign from the presidency of the Bemidji State Teachers' College but was granted a military leave of absence by the Board on August 23, 1943. My appointment terminates automatically upon Dr. Sattgast's return. The official minutes of the August, 1943, meeting indicate clearly the cordial relations between the Board and Dr. Sattgast.

A. C. CLARK, President,
Bemidji, Minn. State Teachers' College

SIR: Former members of the State Teachers' College Board informed me of the political pressure exerted on Dr. Sattgast.

I confidently believe that he accepted the army commission in order to get away from such pressure and to wait for future political developments in Minnesota.

New York City HOWARD Y. WILLIAMS

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Lewis Booth, chairman of the Dayton Public Service League, Dayton, Ohio, writes to us about Senator Robert A. Taft, who is a candidate for reëlection and is being opposed by William G. Pickrel on the Democratic ticket. Mr. Booth points out that Senator Taft has the (doubtless embarrassing) support of Gerald L. K. Smith and Colonel McCormick. He says Mr. Taft is a Red-baiter and harsh critic of labor, and that he sought to prevent the current sedition trials in Washington. Mr. Booth quotes from an article in The Columbus Dispatch, where Mr. Taft was reported as attacking the New Deal, praising Governor Bricker and pleading for a return to the statesmanship of President McKinley. The Dispatch quoted Senator Taft as saying: "It is an inspiration for me to come back from the artificial voices, *often with a foreign accent*, which are raised at Washington, to get in touch with those who really believe in America," etc. (italics by Mr. Booth).

Two persons have written in to express their appreciation of the article by Eduard C. Lindeman, "Division in Education" (The New Republic, June 12). Miss Jean Owens of the Children's Service Association, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, says that "In the midst of considerable confused wrangling over our philosophy of education, Dr. Lindeman's current article in The New Republic comes like a clarion call." Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota, says, "I think all educators are indebted to Dr. Lindeman for his clear and succinct statement of the divisions in education. . . . I agree most enthusiastically that 'a liberalizing education is not one which shuts the learner off from the work of the world,' and therefore no distinction can be made between vocational and so-called liberal education. True education must have both aspects."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

All the Way

THE LIEUTENANT was killed before the landing barge hit the Italian beachhead. Then the ranking sergeant is shot down on the shore. Waiting for orders, the platoon is strafed and its only regular-army non-com is wounded and must be left behind as the outfit starts down a dusty, sun-drenched road toward its objective, a German-held farmhouse six miles inland. What happens from that point on is well worth reading Harry Brown's little book[1] to discover.

Mr. Brown has turned his individual talent (he is a capable poet and the creator of "Artie Greengroin," whose antics enliven or deface the pages of Yank according to your temper) to the tradition of the war novel which grew up after the last holocaust and is conventionally believed to extend back to "The Red Badge of Courage" and Tolstoy's "Sevastopol." It deals with unheroic heroes, with the fellowship of unfriendly men and with the garrulities of the inarticulate. Thus the motto of the platoon is a bitter "Nobody dies" as their comrades drop beside them; each expression of generosity, sympathy or tenderness must be accompanied by an oath or an insult; and in the several hours covered by the book's action there is as much conversation per page as in one of the later novels of Henry James.

Once or twice a deeper voice cuts through the nervous banality of the soldiers' talk, as when the desperate hopelessness of the final action becomes clear to Private Rivera:

"God damn it . . . why don't they ever give them a chance? They never get a chance. We're the dirty god-damned Infantry and they stick us in everywhere. Jesus, there's a hell of a lot of good men going down in this war. Why don't they let us alone? I wish to God that I had every Nazi right in the palm of my hand. I'd crush them to a pulp. Why the hell don't they let us alone?" He subsided as quickly as he had begun.

"Yeah," Friedman said.

Rivera looked at his watch again. "It won't be long now," he said. "A whole new god-damned platoon."

And for Corporal Tyne, whom character and circumstance have conspired to make the leader of the remnant of the platoon, after he has told his men, "We are going all the way," and is leading the attack on the farmhouse:

Everything that had been moving so fast stopped dead. The world stopped. Time stopped. The war stopped. The German machine-gun stopped. What had spun so fast, what had nearly hurled Tyne among the stars, was stopped dead, with such a violence as to shake his body the way a woman shakes a mop from a window. His mind became clear as polished glass. Everything in his life had led up to this moment. It was his. Nothing could take it from him.

Slowly, almost gravely, he rose to his feet and blew a blast on his whistle. Men rose all around him. He saw them sharply in the shimmering air. He broke into a run. Beside him he saw Archimbeau start to run too, and then suddenly stumble with a surprised look on his face and go tumbling down like a sack. . . . Tyne knew that he was running gracefully toward the farmhouse, the mysterious farmhouse, the farmhouse that was waiting to gather him in and hide him from the world. Its windows were eyes, and they were looking at him, studying his every move and the movements of the men with him. The farmhouse loomed up, and it was waiting.

Behind it there were two more explosions, and somewhere in the next world Rivera's finger was on the trigger of his gun and he was singing.

They were all singing. All of them.

"It is so easy," Tyne said aloud as he ran. "It is so terribly easy."

That it *isn't* easy, of course, everyone knows; but it is unalterably part of the tradition to say that it is. The continual bitching is the foil and counterpart of the unemotional "We are going all the way," which will have for many of the men a grave and double meaning.

Interspersed among the descriptions of action and the recording of conversations are several passages in which the author speaks directly, often wisely but frequently with pseudo-profundity. In one such passage that combines, I think, both of these attributes, he has provided the coda for his book and for modern war which in the words of one of the leaders of the United Nations, "is becoming less ideological."

War, without virtue in itself, breeds virtue. It breeds patience in the impatient and heroism in the cowardly. But mostly it breeds patience. For war is a dull business, the dullest business on earth. War is a period of waiting. . . . The soldier learns to wait meekly, hoping that something will happen. And when the period of waiting is at an end the something that does happen isn't what he expected. So in the end he learns to wait and expect nothing. That is patience, God's one great gift to the soldier.

My first reaction upon finishing Mr. Brown's book was to ask impatiently why the extraordinary union of intelligence, skills, courage and endurance that emerges from modern war could not be turned to the prevention of war and the uses of peace. Those who seek a peaceful society have appealed to man's emotions and his reason without success. Could an appeal to his sense of craftsmanship, to what is unrhythmically called his "know-how," have a happier result? Except in the business of preparing for and making war, are the Riveras, the Friedmans, the Archimbeaus, the Tynes slobs? To ask it might stir up the salutary anger that Rivera voiced for a moment, the necessary answer to the widespread passivism that Santayana recently expressed: "There has been so much killing and so much suffering in the world's history. It is always the same." Better still, it might lead to a long-range, efficacious resentment.

"Watch carefully what you do with your resentment," Arthur Koestler has said. "It is the only historical asset of the poor; without it they would still live in serfdom."

GEORGE MAYBERRY

[1] A Walk in the Sun, by Harry Brown. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 187 pages. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor Kibitzer

Tailor's Progress, by Benjamin Stolberg. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. An American Mercury Book. 360 pages. $2.75.

"TAILOR'S PROGRESS" is a kibitzer kibitzing about kibitzers. The author criticizes the kibitzers more than he praises them; he dislikes more men than he likes, and there is no one in the book that the author really loves unless it be Benjamin Stolberg himself.

Yet this personal history of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILG) ranks as a top-notch volume in the recorded history of American labor. It excels any of the books that have so far appeared in Farrar and Rinehart's Labor in Twentieth-Century America series. The first of these was Joel Seidman's "The Needle Trades," which (as it covers the other needle-trades unions as well as the ILG) is an economic-statistical history. It is not really a competitor but a companion to Stolberg's volume, which is devoid of statistics and basic economic analysis. "Tailor's Progress" is history recorded through the personal lives of the men who have had the greatest influence upon the birth and growth of the ILG. In fact, the only claim Stolberg's kibitzing has to being history rests upon the implicit theory of the book that the lives of big men have greater bearing on the turn of events than any other single factor.

Now for the juicy features of this juicy book. Here are a few choice Stolbergisms about people:

> Sidney Hillman . . . the white-haired boy of the city's leading social workers . . . talks like an article in The New Republic. . . . The rear end of the Knudsenhillman combination. . . . He is the typical ham Machiavelli who almost always outsmarts himself.
>
> Benjamin Schlesinger . . . a born agitator . . . the last of the great immigrant leaders of the women's garment workers. . . . He wanted to exact agreement, not obedience. . . . He looked upon himself as a union patriarch. . . . He was a handsomer version of Abe Lincoln . . . precocious in his leadership. . . . He was a gifted prima donna. His vanity was incredible . . . a Lord Byron among the labor leaders.
>
> David Dubinsky . . . is a congenital centrist . . . a natural born opportunist. . . . The occupational disease of all leaders is egotism. . . . Dubinsky has his due share of egotism. . . . He is of the round-faced Churchill-Hoover type who at first glance look like babies and on second glance decidedly do not. . . . Behind all his zest and fun Dubinsky is intangibly aloof. . . . For all his social intelligence, Dubinsky lacks that final touch which would lift his high-minded opportunism to the level of statesmanship. . . .

Whether Stolberg's batting average for accuracy is high or low I don't know, but one case each of faulty evaluation and gross injustice should be mentioned.

All great unions have one leader who stands out above all others: in the ILG Stolberg votes for Dubinsky, yet the man who stands out in "Tailor's Progress" is Benjamin Schlesinger, president in 1903 and for two longer terms, 1914-23 and 1928-32. When he was not leading the ILG officially, Schlesinger was on The Jewish Daily Forward. Stolberg reports: "He never really left either The Forward or the union." Note that this powerful Yiddish paper had great influence on the garment workers and the ILG's policies in Schlesinger's time. There probably would be no question about Schlesinger's being the greatest ILG leader if he had served continuously from his first term in 1903 until his death in 1932, or if tales of his prima-donna proclivities had not lived after him to blur his truly great stature. Only he could get Julius Rosenwald to lend $50,000 to a bankrupt union, and when the ILG was mortally wounded by Communist disruption, Schlesinger, not Dubinsky, was elected president to heal the wound.

As for Stolberg's treatment of Hillman, it can only be described as plain vituperation. One of his complaints against Hillman is that he didn't work in the shop long enough, and went into labor leadership too fast. Yet in Dubinsky's case there is some evidence that he would be a greater leader if he hadn't spent so much time as a cutter. Stolberg says that Hillman was a bust in Washington, and while it is true Hillman was no great shakes in the capital, still he had the guts to give it a try. Dubinsky, on the other hand, has never made such a try, and maybe it is because (as "Tailor's Progress" records several times) he has felt, "I didn't think I was big enough."

Much of Stolberg's kibitzing is aimed at the Communists. He records how they almost killed the ILG in the twenties and rejoices over the way the ILG has killed them inside its fold. I agree that a union cannot tolerate a Communist group inside its ranks except at the peril of disruption and chaos. Note how clean Hillman's Amalgamated and Murray's Steelworkers are of Communists. Stolberg records that of the 900 delegates to the 1944 ILG convention, only six were Communists; the 1944 Steelworkers' convention had 2,300 delegates and not even six of them were Communists. This is one thing; it is quite another to argue, as Stolberg does, that the ILG or any other union devoid of Communists can't coöperate with a union that is wholly or partially Communist-led.

The weakest chapter in "Tailor's Progress" is the one on why the ILG left the CIO. Dubinsky took his union back into the AFL because he and his fellow officers craved social respectability, and the anti-status-quo CIO took this away from them. I dare say that Dubinsky, in formal evening dress, got a bigger kick out of presenting "Pins and Needles" to President Roosevelt at the White House than he did out of any other single act in his public life.

My feeling is that a reviewer should tell the essential facts of a book and evaluate them, not attempt to impose upon the reader his own ideas on the subject. This I have always tried to do, but with Stolberg's book I have been compelled to violate this feeling. "Tailor's Progress" is kibitzing and there's not much a reviewer can do but kibitz about it. The factual material is excellent, for, I understand, it comes mainly from Will Herberg (research director of the New York Dress Joint Board of the ILG), who is one of the best researchers in the labor movement. But the kibitzing is all Stolberg's, and, therefore, should you bite into this book, do so with a mouthful of salt, because Stolberg is the kind of man who, if he were a baseball fan, would criticize Babe Ruth for the way he hit a homer and Lou Gehrig for the way he covered first. After all, Stolberg is not much more than a Dodger kibitzer in the labor movement.

HAROLD J. RUTTENBERG

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Villard on the Press

The Disappearing Daily, by Oswald Garrison Villard. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 285 pages. $3.50.

IT HAS LONG been obvious that one of the three or four most pressing problems of this country concerns the social function of the press. In any democracy it is imperative that the citizens should be promptly, correctly and fully informed. The newspaper undertakes to perform this function; but it does so only as a by-product of the process of making money, which in nearly all cases means selling advertising space. These two purposes of the press do not go very well in double harness and, as a result, journalism and its readers are often far apart on many of the most important public questions of the day. Judging by election results, Gallup Polls and other tests, the newspapers are far more conservative than their readers. Labor is heavily underrepresented in the press; so are racial minorities like the Negro. On the whole, the newspapers speak most loudly, sincerely and often on behalf of the small minority in the community which has most of the wealth and the power.

Oswald Garrison Villard, former editor of The New York Post and The Nation, has been concerned with this problem all his life. He wrote a book about it in 1923, published a revised edition in 1926 and now paraphrases a good deal of the same material, with further revision, in "The Disappearing Daily." Mr. Villard doesn't know what to do about American journalism; his only suggestion is what seems to me the despairing one that there may be such a development of the affairs of the world and of the present worldwide revolution as will again bring to the editorial chairs men of fire and passion, with programs to further and vital, stirring causes to lead.

In the meantime, Mr. Villard sees the press, as a whole, deteriorating. By his title he means that the total number of dailies in the country is getting smaller. This is true, but I can't see why Mr. Villard is excited about it. The shrinkage is small in numbers and it does not mean that chain ownership is growing more important, because the chief chains are themselves shrinking. In any case, the thing to worry about is the total amount of circulation and its control.

In separate chapters Mr. Villard discusses the Associated Press, The New York Times, Herald Tribune and Daily News, The Christian Science Monitor, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the chains of Scripps-Howard, Frank Gannett, Hearst, Marshall Field and other journalistic phenomena. The author's bitter opposition to President Roosevelt and to the war enter into many of his chapters and, in my opinion at least, color and distort his judgment. He finds it hard to be severe with other enemies of the administration, like Cissie and Joe Patterson, Colonel McCormick and Roy Howard. Some of these individuals he has denounced bitterly in his earlier writings, and he oscillates unhappily between those previous verdicts and his present fellow feeling. I admit I was astonished to find him identifying freedom of the press with the freedom of the publishers to force their conservatism down everybody's throat, as well as by his bland assumptions that before Pearl Harbor we were in no danger of attack by Hitler, and that a majority of all Americans are isolationist at this moment.

Mr. Villard seems to me to stack the cards against the newspaper, in certain instances. He does not give enough importance to the better education of reporters, to the good effects of the Newspaper Guild, or even to improvements in the morals of the press in the last twenty-five years under pressure of critics like Upton Sinclair and Mr. Villard himself. He attaches too much importance to special incidents that happen to have come under his personal observation, and he sometimes assumes a sinister motive in suppressing news when there may have been, and probably was, another explanation. Bad as the press is, in at least some of its aspects, it is getting better; and Mr. Villard's black pessimism seems to me not to take account of all the facts.

BRUCE BLIVEN

To the North

Alaska and the Canadian Northwest, by Harold Griffin. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 221 pages. $2.75.
Far North Country, by Thames Williamson. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 236 pages. $3.
Our Hidden Front, by William Gilman. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 266 pages. $3.
Dominion of the North, by Donald Grant Creighton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 535 pages. $3.50.

FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY of the wartime importance of Alaska and the Canadian Northwest, and the deluge of plans for polar airlines and economic development in the postwar years, perhaps it was inevitable that the vast territory also should be discovered by authors and publishers. The present three books about this territory presage future efforts, like these a mixture of travelogue, history and prediction, all written in a personal-narrative style.

In "Alaska and the Canadian Northwest" this style breaks down and becomes a series of names, places and dialogues, interspersed by the author's remarks on Edmonton, Fairbanks, the Alaska Highway and other northern cities and wartime developments. There is a longer, but inconclusive, consideration of the Canol project. But, as a reporter, Mr. Griffin projects into his book some of the color of new frontier territory, tortuous railways, wild bush flying, and the tremendous work which produced the Alaska Highway.

"Far North Country," one of the series of American Folkways edited by Erskine Caldwell, is a slangy, breezy account of some of the highlights of Alaska's story. First came the wandering ancestors of the Indians, pushing inland as later wanderers arrived from Asia. Centuries later Russians exploited the territory, drawn in search of the fur-bearing sea otter, until, in 1867, the frontier-seeking Americans bought the territory for a little less than "two cents an acre." Promptly they relegated it to an obscurity broken only by a few mad rushes for gold and the rather chilly fame brought by the writings of Robert Service, Jack London and Rex Beach. Only with the war, and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attack on the Aleutians by the Japanese, was Alaska really rediscovered. One interesting discussion of recent history concerns the settlement at Matanuska, which was vigorously attacked by opponents of the New Deal. The author says that "the project is making good; it is also demonstrating that agriculture can succeed in Alaska."

William Gilman reached Alaska shortly after Pearl Harbor and remained as a war correspondent for nearly two years. "Our Hidden Front" tells the story of prewar lack of interest in the northland; later the efforts to repair defenses were hampered by rivalry between the army and navy, as well as a desire by some interests to continue business-as-usual. A detailed account of the attack on Attu pictures a grim, hard-fought battle in bitter, fog-shrouded surroundings—surroundings which are given added reality by an appendix of photographs of bleak, harsh terrain. In his conclusion, Mr. Gilman examines Alaska with regard to possibilities of future wars, possibilities which are hard to face but by no means improbable.

Besides books on Alaska, the war years have produced a number of works interpreting Canada, its history, politics and economics, to the United States. None has been as worthy of serious consideration as "Dominion of the North," by Donald Grant Creighton, associate professor of History at the University of Toronto. Canada needs intelligent interpretation, both to the rest of the world and her own citizens; for she is a country wrestling with two loyalties—to the British Empire and the Americas—and two diverse cultures. Unlike most authors of Canadian historical works, Professor Creighton shows more interest in political, cultural and economic changes than mere events and dates. Differences in Canada arose when the British conquered the country, leaving a small British ruling class and a large, established French-Canadian group to work out a difficult destiny. Twice, when the small colony was at war with the United States, the French-Canadians proved their deep devotion to Canada. These two wars, considered by most Canadians purely as American military imperialism, were followed by boundary disputes, in which Canada's part consisted of "frantic efforts to escape becoming a burnt offering on the altar of Anglo-American friendship," as she faced "the shadow of British indifference and American hostility." Later came friendlier relations and the long, undefended boundary.

There is an interesting consideration, at some length, of the Canadian struggle for responsible government and a balanced internal political system. Late years have brought this more balanced government, upsetting a number of earlier judicial decisions which frequently were "unhampered by even the thought of historical research" on the part of British authorities. Recent vast changes have left even this comprehensive work behind, and it can do little more than record the birth of the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups, which are reflecting the turmoil of recent years and a widespread desire for a more balanced economic distribution. "Dominion of the North" is a scholarly, honest account of Canadian history, indulging neither in imperialistic flag-waving nor a desire to gloss over the difficulties which have frequently occurred in Canadian-United States relations.

ROBERT LEIGH WEAVER

Anti-Anti-Semitism

Must Men Hate? by Sigmund Livingston. New York: Harper and Brothers. 344 pages. $2.50.

THE WORLD THINKS it knows the Jews, but it knows only their beards," complained Heinrich Heine, a hundred years ago. Beards or no beards, Mr. Livingston believes that anti-Semitism can be traced to the ignorance or misinformation about the Jew, prevalent in the Gentile world. Jew-hatred, says Mr. Livingston, is not inherited but acquired. The children pick it up from certain nasty lines in "Mother Goose" or from Grimm's "Fairy Tales," the adolescents from "The Merchant of Venice": "If the members of the graduating class of any high school were asked to name a Jew in fiction, they would reply in unison: 'Shylock!' If they were asked to name a world-renowned scientist or author or musician of Jewish origin, many . . . probably could not name a single one."

The author, founder and erstwhile president of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the world's largest Jewish fraternal organization, undertakes for the hundredth (or perhaps thousandth?) time to destroy certain obnoxious superstitions concerning the Jews, canards which, idiotic though we know them to be, are still used successfully by the fascists in their anti-Jewish campaigns. They range from the medieval ritual blood accusation to the more recent assertion that the Jews are shirkers (a convincing refutation of that claim is this book's list of American Jewish servicemen who have received official awards). "There is not a single accusation against the Jews which was not directed against the Christians during the first four centuries of the Christian era." The author might have added that some of the slogans now employed against the Jews were originally used by old-stock Americans against Irish and other immigrants.

Much space is devoted to the Jewish contributions to civilization; the appendix contains an "honor roll" of 700 distinguished Jewish names in the fields of modern arts and sciences. In so far as it may aid decent, truth-seeking non-Jews looking for material with which to refute anti-Semitic lies, the book is of considerable value. But will it change the minds of hard-boiled anti-Semites who, as Mr. Livingston asserts, are "paralogists," allergic to reason?

Strangely enough, the author himself is influenced by such "thinking." Otherwise he would not have endeavored to "exonerate" the Jews by stressing such facts as, for instance: that only one out of thirteen directors of the National Broadcasting Company and only one of the seventeen members of the Soviet Russian Politbureau are Jews. Is it a crime for a Jew to head either the Soviet Union or the National Broadcasting Company? And suppose 30, or even 90, percent of the big shots in either body were Jewish, would this justify a trend that, as Livingston points out correctly, is both unreasonable and un-Christian?

The author admits that the complete eradication of anti-Jewish antagonism is a long-term process; nevertheless, he hopes that "the cruelty, the savagery and the utter wickedness of Nazi anti-Semitism, when fully known, will so shock the conscience of the civilized world that anti-Semitism will be anathematized by all civilized governments and by all justice-loving people." ALFRED WERNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Reader's List

PLANNING: NO. 221. BRITISH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS (Political and Economic Planning, available through The New Republic, 25 cents). The rapid and often amazing growth of trade associations in Britain has made them a matter of deep concern to anyone interested in the future of British economic organization. Yet there have been few detailed studies of the structure and function of these influential but little known groups. PEP now remedies this deficiency; the present broadsheet is one of the "first factual accounts of trade associations as a whole to be published in these last twenty years." PEP's study, which makes frequent comparisons with American experience, is based on a statistical analysis of one hundred British trade associations. While the admitted purposes of the associations are to represent members in matters of legislation, to gather useful information and to arbitrate disputes among members, the most common activities are related to standardization of products, patent pooling, price agreements, price control and the regulation of output and market sharing. PEP does not weigh pros and cons in this pamphlet; the evaluation of trade associations is reserved for a later broadsheet.

THE AMERICAN WAY, by Maxwell S. Stewart (Public Affairs Committee, 10 cents). Mr. Stewart's pamphlet is a good antidote for the "free enterprise" pap that is being fed to the American public these days. "The American way," he says, "has never been one of complete freedom in economic matters." Even in the frontier days there was considerable government interference. Business men seldom objected so long as state intervention benefited them. Land grants, tariffs and fair trade acts were quite welcome. Yet when government tries to provide jobs in times of depression it is accused of dictatorship; if it does nothing, then bureaucrats are stupidly ruining the nation. Mr. Stewart advises that we stop using meaningless labels and try to find some practicable middle way between complete economic anarchy and thoroughgoing state control. Our economy, he says, can be based on an admixture of private enterprise and government participation. The suggested areas for government interference are public housing, soil conservation, social security, public health and education. That still leaves a pretty wide region of activity for the expression of individual initiative.

Contributors

RICHARD LEE STROUT is a member of the Washington staff of The Christian Science Monitor. He is now in London covering the war for that newspaper.

BERNARD B. SMITH, a New York attorney who has studied radio for many years, is the author of a number of magazine articles on the subject. He testified before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, at the committee's invitation, on a proposed new radio law.

JOSEPH ROSENFARB, the labor-relations editor of the Research Institute of America, has also been on the legal staff of the National Labor Relations Board. He is the author of two books, "The National Labor Policy" and "Highway to Tokyo," and has published several articles on legal, labor and military subjects.

HAROLD J. RUTTENBERG, a well known figure in the field of labor relations, is research director of the United Steelworkers of America. He is co-author, with Clinton S. Golden, of "The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy."

ROBERT LEIGH WEAVER was recently discharged from the Canadian Army after two years' service in Canada and is now free-lancing.

ALFRED WERNER, a Viennese, was graduated from the University of Vienna. For editing an anti-Nazi weekly, he was put into a concentration camp. After internment in England, he came to America in 1940.

RESORTS

MERRIEWOODE
A CAMP FOR ADULTS STODDARD, N. H.
FOR YOUR ENJOYMENT: Beautiful Highland Lake, 10 miles long, with good fishing and free use of boats and canoes; interesting hiking objectives thru woodland trails; fine tennis and handball courts, badminton, shuffleboard, archery, riflery, croquet, ping-pong, square dancing; intelligent, gay companionship.
$38 and $42 weekly Opening—June 23
Olive H. G. Baron, Dir.

HILLTOP LODGE
ON BEAUTIFUL SYLVAN LAKE
R. R. Sta., Pawling, N.Y.
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Only 65 Miles from New York City
Every Sport & Recreation • Golf Free
P. Wolfson and S. Rothauser, Dir.
N. Y. Office: 277 Broadway • CO 7-3938

FORTY-LOVE
Because South Wind (with a capacity of 100) has built its four clay tennis courts with care, it has attracted a "Tennis Crowd"
—a young, eager group of fine adults.
SOUTH WIND
WOODBOURNE, N. Y.
LARGE PRIVATE LAKE • ALL SPORTS
Attractive June Rates

CABINS FOR RENT

GRANITE LAKE CABINS: Each with private bath, Simmons Beds. Swimming and boating. Excellent food. $60 a week double. Adults only. Box 77, Munsonville, New Hampshire.

CHILDREN'S CAMPS

. . . A FEW VACANCIES
RIVERWOOD SUMMER ARTS GROUP
FOR GIRLS FROM TEN TO EIGHTEEN
Overlooking the Hudson River
HIGHLAND, NEW YORK
An experience in creative group living for 20 girls, where the emphasis is upon rhythmic movement, dance, theatre, painting, drawing.
Under the direction of two well-known artist-teachers.
ELIZABETH and DON OSCAR BECQUE
MU 5-5871 • 264 5th AVE. • AL 4-9498

SMILING HILLS CAMP
EAST STROUDSBURG, PA.
A progressive camp for boys and girls, from 4 to 12 years of age. All activities. Non-sectarian. Non-regimented. Individual care. (Limited to 50 campers.)
Write: James & Nellie Dick, Modern School, 115 Cary Street, Lakewood, N. J.
PHONE 1007

VERMONT VACATION

RESTFUL, COUNTRY LIVING with small group. Beautiful surroundings. $23-26 week. Write to Relan Gray, Ethan Allen Farm, R.F.D. No. 2, Chester, Vermont.

WANTED TO BUY

PHONOGRAPH LANGUAGE SETS. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City 17, N. Y.

Classified Rates: 6 point type (6 words to the line), 50c a type line; 5 point type (7 words to the line), 45c a type line. Minimum ad 3 lines.

OUR MEN WANT BOOKS ★
Send all you can spare ★ Ask your bookseller how

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED